

California High-Speed Train Project



TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Alternatives Analysis for Siting Maintenance Facilities

Prepared By: Steven Wolf 10/27/09
Steven Wolf

Checked By: Bryan Porter 10/27/09
Bryan Porter

Approved By: Steven Wolf 10/28/09
Steven Wolf, Environmental Manager

Released By: Anthony Daniels 10/30/09
Anthony Daniels, Program Director

Accepted By: Dan Leavitt 10/30/09
Dan Leavitt, Deputy Director, CHSRA

Revision	Date	Description
0	31 August 09	Initial Release
1	07 September 09	FRA Review
2	30 September 09	PMT Revisions
3	14 October 09	PMT Revisions
4	26 October 09	Authority Revisions

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	PURPOSE	1
2.0	HST MAINTENANCE REQUIREMENTS	1
3.0	APPROACH	2
3.1	COORDINATION	4
4.0	EVALUATION MEASURES	5
4.1	COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE SITES	5
 APPENDIX A: Technical Memoranda 5.3 Summary Description of Requirements and Guidelines for Heavy Maintenance Facility, Terminal Layup/Storage and Maintenance Facilities, and Right-Of-Way Maintenance Facilities		

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1.0 PURPOSE

This memorandum serves as a guide to the regional teams in conducting an Alternatives Analysis (AA) for the siting of maintenance facilities for the California High-Speed Train (HST) project sections of the HST system. The HST System will require the following types of maintenance facilities:

- Terminal and Heavy Vehicle Maintenance Facility (HMF)
- Terminal Layup/Storage & Maintenance Facilities (TSMF)
- Right-of-Way Maintenance Facilities (MOWF)

The siting requirements for these different facilities are summarized in Section 2.0 of this memorandum and presented in detail in Technical Memoranda TM 5.1, Terminal and Heavy Maintenance Facility Guidelines, dated August 25, 2009, TM 5.3, Summary Description of Requirements and Guidelines for Heavy Maintenance Facility, Terminal Layup/Storage and Maintenance Facilities, and Right-of-Way Maintenance Facilities, dated August 25, 2009. TM 5.3 is included in this document as Appendix A.

The AA will identify feasible and practicable alternative maintenance facility sites to carry forward for environmental review and evaluation in Environmental Impact Reports/Environmental Impact Statements (EIR/EIS) for sections of the California HST Project (CHSTP). In conducting the AA the regional teams will begin analysis using the guidance provided in TM 5.1 and TM 5.3 and with consideration of the alternatives selected with the previously prepared statewide and Bay Area program EIRs/EISs. Plans and representative sections will be developed and used for the preliminary evaluation of alternatives maintenance sites. The AA evaluations will be used to assist the California High-Speed Rail Authority (Authority) and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) in identifying a reasonable range of feasible alternative maintenance facility sites to analyze in the draft project EIR/EIS. The guidelines contained in this memorandum are designed to maintain consistency among the regional teams in identifying an appropriate range of alternative maintenance facility sites to analyze in each EIR/EIS, conducting a preliminary analysis, applying evaluation measures, and documenting the evaluation process, while still allowing flexibility to account for consideration of regional differences.

The Authority and the FRA will make the results of the AA available for agency and public input. The AA will support decisions guiding the project design and environmental review process, including specifically the identification of alternative maintenance sites to be further considered in the project environmental analysis and reasons to dismiss alternatives that will not be carried forward in the EIR/EIS analysis. The Authority and the FRA will make these decisions considering agency and public input. The results of the alternatives analysis for siting of maintenance facilities will be presented in a report providing the basis for drafting the Alternatives chapter in the Draft and Final Project EIR/EIS.

The AA for the siting of maintenance facilities presented in this memorandum will follow the same process and approach presented in the Technical Memorandum Alternatives Analysis Methods for Project EIR/EIS Version 2, dated September 2009.

The maintenance site alternatives identified in the Final AA as practicable and feasible will be added to the Draft Project Description incorporating a description of the alternatives to be carried forward for environmental review. The Draft Project Description will describe all design features and assumptions for the maintenance facilities to support environmental evaluation and will be updated and finalized when a level of 15% preliminary engineering design is completed.

2.0 HST Maintenance Requirements

Based on a service design driven by the CHSTP ridership demand forecast, the Authority developed an operating plan to define train schedules and estimate the number of train-sets needed for the CHSTP rolling stock fleet. In order to support the commissioning activities, layup/storage and maintenance program requirements, and ultimate retirement for the vehicle fleet, concepts were developed for the daily Terminal Layup/Storage and Maintenance Facilities (TSMF) and a Heavy Maintenance Facility (HMF)

An AA Draft Report will be prepared that presents the results of the AA process to this point. The AA Draft Report will include a preliminary definition of the alternative maintenance sites using the applicable Technical Memoranda TM 5.1 and TM 5.3.

Step 7: Initiate PMT/Authority/FRA/AG Review

The AA Draft Report will be reviewed by the PMT/Authority/FRA. When approved for release, the AA Draft Report will be posted to the Authority's website.

Step 8: Make Presentation to CAHSRA Board

The results of the AA Draft Report will be presented to the Board as an information agenda item.

Step 9: Conduct Outreach to Agencies and Public

The alternative maintenance sites identified for inclusion in the EIR/EIS will be presented to the local and state participating, responsible, and trustee agencies and the federal participating and cooperating agencies identified in the CAHST Agency Coordination Plan and have agreed to participate in the HST Project environmental process. Non-governmental agencies such as operating railroads will also be included as part of the outreach. The alternatives identified for inclusion in the EIR/EIS will also be presented to Native American tribes and minority and/or low income interest groups as part of the outreach implementation for HST Projects presented in Technical Memo *Agency, Environmental Justice, and Tribal Coordination Guidelines for Project Level EIR/EIS* dated July 31, 2009.

Following the presentation to the agencies and non government agencies, a similar effort will be conducted for the public. Public information meetings will be conducted, as needed, to present the alternatives identified for inclusion in the EIR/EIS.

Step 10: Prepare Alternatives Analysis (AA) Final Report

An AA Draft Report will be finalized and will include the results of outreach meetings and consultation with cooperating and other agencies. The AA Final Report will be reviewed by the PMT/Authority/FRA and upon completion posted to the Authority's website when approved for release.

Step 11: Draft Project Description

The results of the AA Final Report and the level of engineering design completed to date will be included in the draft Project Description.

3.1 COORDINATION

Each Regional Team will coordinate their efforts with the PMT, Authority, and FRA. Coordination will also occur with other Regional Teams, as needed, for similar technical work occurring with immediately adjacent sections of the proposed HST system.

Preliminary information including the initial alternative sites and evaluation shall be presented to the PMT, Authority, and FRA using diagrams, drawings, memoranda, and presentations that effectively communicate the information while minimizing preparation time and effort. The AA reports will be initially reviewed by the PMT, revised, and submitted to the Authority and FRA for their review and comment. In addition, each AA Report will contain a discussion of the coordination and consultation efforts related to alternatives analysis and opportunities for agency and public input in the process.

4.0 EVALUATION MEASURES

4.1 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE SITES

Measures to evaluate and compare the alternative maintenance sites are described below. Where it is possible to quantify the effects, estimates are to be provided, and where it is not possible to quantify effects, qualitative evaluation should be provided.

- A. Land use consistent with existing, adopted local, regional, and state plans, and is supported by existing or future growth areas as measured by:

Measurement	Method	Source
Economic benefits to cities and local communities	Quantitative to the extent possible using available data, addressing both direct and indirect benefits, (e.g., jobs creation with corresponding revenues due to purchases of local goods and services, etc.)	Input from local economic and redevelopment agencies and chambers of commerce.
Consistency with local zoning and other planning efforts and adopted plans	Qualitative – General analysis of applicable planning and policy documents	Land use analysis and input from planning agencies
Availability of local labor force to support employment needs	Quantitative to the extent possible using available data	Current unemployment data; regional employment growth projections; and input from local agencies, chambers of commerce, and local labor unions

- B. Construction of the alternative is feasible in terms of engineering challenges and right-of-way constraints as measured by:

Measurement	Method	Source
Capital and operating costs	Availability of potential locations offered to the Authority that could meet the Authority's maintenance facility siting requirements	Requests for Expressions of Interest for Maintenance Facilities issued as a public notice requesting the community and/or interested parties to identify potential locations that could meet the Authority's maintenance facility siting requirements.
Constructability, access for construction; within existing transportation ROW	Extent of feasible access to alignment for construction	Conceptual design plans and maps
Disruption to and relocation of utilities	Number of utilities affected	Conceptual design plans and maps

- C. Minimize disruption to neighborhoods and communities – extent to which an alternative minimizes right-of-way acquisitions, minimizes dividing an established community and minimizes conflicts with community resources as measured by:

Measurement	Method	Source
Displacements	If possible, number of properties by land use type that would be displaced. Or acres of land within the right-of-way/station footprint, by type of land use: single family, multifamily, retail/commercial, industrial, etc.	Identified comparing the alignment conceptual design drawings with aerial photographs, zoning maps, and General Plan maps.
Local Traffic Effects	Identify potential locations where increase in traffic congestion or LOS are expected to occur.	Existing traffic LOS from local jurisdictions

- D. Minimize impacts to environmental resources – extent to which an alternative minimizes impacts on natural resources as measured by:

Measurement	Method	Source
Waterways and wetlands and nature preserves or biologically sensitive habitat areas affected	Identify the presence and an estimate of acres of wetlands and species of T&E habitat affected; acres of natural areas/critical habitat affected	Measured off conceptual design plans and GIS layers; Section 404(b)1 analysis
Cultural resources	Identify locations of NRHP or CHRIS listed properties. For archaeological resources identify areas of high or moderate sensitivity based on previous studies conducted in the study area.	Based on conceptual design plans and GIS layers; Section 4(f) studies and cultural resource records search and surveys
Agricultural lands	Acres of prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, unique farmland, and farmland of local importance to be displaced	Based on conceptual design plans and GIS layers

- E. Extent to which an alternative minimizes impacts on the natural environment as measured by:

Measurement	Method	Source
Noise/Vibration effects on sensitive receivers	Identify types of land use activities that would be affected by maintenance activities	Results of screening level assessment: inventory of potential receivers from site survey and aerial maps
Maximize avoidance of areas with potential hazardous materials	Hazardous materials/waste constraints	Data from previous records search conducted for other projects within study area.

APPENDIX A

Technical Memoranda 5.3, Summary Description of Requirements and Guidelines for Heavy Maintenance Facility, Terminal Layup/Storage and Maintenance Facilities, and Right-of-Way Maintenance Facilities

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK